

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

	PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	09/461,158	12/14/1999	ANNE E. MILLER	042390.P6958	3401
	759	90 04/08/2003			
	Blakeley Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman llp Raymond J Werner 12400 Wilshire Boulevard			EXAMINER	
 .				MACKEY, TERRENCE M	
	7TH Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			1765	15
				DATE MAILED: 04/08/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			_ / \/				
1,000	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/461,158	MILLER ET A	L.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Terrence Mackey	1765					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover	sheet with the correspond no	e address				
Peri d for Reply	(IO OFT TO EVE	DE AMONTHIES EROM					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, howev y within the statutory minin will apply and will expire St cause the application to l	er, may a reply be timely filed num of thirty (30) days will be considered X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of to the companies of the com	nis communication.				
Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
, _	— · is action is non- fin	al					
3) Since this application is in condition for allows			to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Disp sition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle , 1	1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 - 14 and 28 - 33</u> is/are pending in t	he application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	wn from consider a	tion.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) is/are rejected.		•					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requir en	nent.					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority u nder 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority document							
2. Certified copies of the priority document							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 1	7.2 (a)) .	onai Stage				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	ic priorit <mark>y under 35</mark>	U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisi	onal application).				
 a) The translation of the foreign language pro 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest 							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Pape Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:					
S. Patent and Trademark Office							

Application/Control Number: 09/461,158

Art Unit: ***

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 14 and 28 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farkas et al. (US 6,001,730) in view of Kaufman et al. (US 6,063,306).

Farkas discloses a chemical mechanical polishing slurry useful for polishing copper interconnects. A silicon substrate is provided. A dielectric layer is formed over the substrate. A trench is formed through the dielectric layer (column 4, lines 42-48). A tantalum-based barrier layer is formed within the trench. The tantalum-based barrier layer is one or more of tantalum, tantalum nitride, composites thereof or the like in a preferred form (column 4, lines 49-54). A conductive copper layer is then deposited over a top surface of the barrier layer and within the trench in the dielectric layer (column 4, lines 59-61). This reads on the applicant's limitation of depositing copper over a diffusion barrier and over a top surface of the dielectric layer. The copper layer is then placed into contact with a chemical mechanical polishing slurry. In order to remove copper material from the layer, the slurry forms a thin copper oxide or oxidized layer on top of the copper layer. This reads on the applicant's limitation of forming a

Application/Control Number: 09/461,158

Art Unit: ***

protective layer over the copper film during polishing. The slurry has a pH of 9.0 to 11.0. The slurry contains 1.0 wt% to 12.0wt% of silica abrasive (column 7, lines 31-40). This reads on the applicant's limitation of polishing the copper layer with a high pH slurry having less than or equal to 10wt% of abrasive.

Unlike the claimed invention Farkas does not teach forming a copper diffusion barrier layer in the trenches.

Kaufman discloses a chemical mechanical polishing slurry useful for polishing a copper/tantalum substrate. Kaufman discloses that tantalum or tantalum alloys can include a layer such as Ta/TaN/Cu (column 4, lines 36-46).

It is the Examiner's position that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify Farkas with the method of using a copper diffusion barrier layer as taught by Kaufman since Farkas is not particular about the type of tantalum-based barrier layer used in his process and therefor any tantalum-based barrier layer would have been anticipated in order to produce an expected result.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments received on December 31, 2002, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In traversing the rejection based on Farkas et al. in view of Kaufman et al., the applicant states that Farkas describes two separate and distinct slurries: a first slurry for polishing copper and a second slurry for polishing the tantalum barrier layer. The

Application/Control Number: 09/461,158

Art Unit: ***

applicant argues that Farkas fails to teach the polishing of a copper layer with a slurry having a high pH and an abrasive in the amount of 10 wt% or less.

The Examiner notes that Farkas discloses that the second slurry polishes both the copper layer and barrier layer. The relative rates for which the copper layer and barrier layer are removed is termed the selectivity and it is important that the selectivity be chosen based upon process factors such as the thickness of the various layers being polished to minimize undesirable dishing of the copper layer.

The Examiner directs the attention of applicant to the second reference of Farkas et al. (US 6,274,478), in particular the disclosure that a slurry substantially similar in concentration and content to that used in a bulk polishing step of a copper layer to form interconnects may be used in a second, slower interfacial polishing step (column 7, lines 5-10).

The Examiner also directs the attention of applicant to the reference of Sasaki et al. (US 5,775,980), in particular the use of a chemical mechanical polishing slurry of 10wt% of silica particles in a dilute aqueous solution of piperazine with pH 11 (column 19, 9-13) for burying a deposited copper film in the trenches to form interconnections.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period of reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the Examiner should be directed to Terrence Mackey whose telephone number is 703-305-5504. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday during the hours of 7:30AM to 4:30PM.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-5408 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

TMM

March 26, 2003

ROBERT KUNEMUND PRIMARY EXAMINER